

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 6, 2006, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 24, 25, and 27-29 have been amended, claims 3, 6, and 26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 34-36 have been added. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-25, and 27-36 thus remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-23, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0189604 (*Lee*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,133,907 (*Liu*). Claims 4, 9, 10, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of *Liu*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,133,907 (*Wu*). Claims 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Liu* in view of *Lee*. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-23

Claim 1, which has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled claims 3 and 6, recites “wherein the image projection system includes a light source, a light blocker having a light transmissive portion and a light blocking portion, and a lens that creates a focal point located substantially on the outer wall for the displayed image.” As correctly indicated on page 2 the Office Action, *Lee* does not disclose a projection image system. Specifically, *Lee* does not teach or suggest a lens or optics for projecting an image, but simply relies on an “ornamental light source 20” and an “ornamental housing 30” to display the image. (*Lee*, paragraphs [0027]-[0028].) However, the Office Action, in the discussion of claim 6, alleges that *Liu* teaches this feature at column 2, lines 22-40. Applicants respectfully disagree. The relied-upon section of *Liu* is reproduced below:

A stepping motor 21 is received in the casing 10 and has a shaft 22 extending therefrom to which a disk 23 is co-rotatably mounted. The disk 23 is a transparent member and has a plurality of pictures 230 marked thereon which are continuous and individual steps of a motion picture 30 such as a running horse shown in FIG. 5. A control means 20, such as an integrated circuit board, for actuating the motor 21 is received in the casing 10 and connected to the button 25 which extends through the opening 110 so that the stepping motor 21 is actuated when the button 25 is pushed. A laser beam generating means 24 is located between the control means 20 and the disk 23, and aligns with the pictures 230 when the disk 23 is co-rotated with the shaft 22 so that when the disk 23 is rotated with the shaft 22 when the stepping motor 21 is actuated, the laser beam from the laser beam generating means 24 passes through each of the pictures 230 in sequence so that a continuous motion picture 30 can be formed.

This section of *Liu* does not disclose or even relate to “a lens that creates a focal point located substantially on the outer wall [of the housing of the computer input device],” as recited in claim 1. In fact, *Liu* never uses a lens to “create a focal point,” but simply projects the image outwardly from the device to a remote wall some unknown distance away. (*Liu*, col. 1, lines 51-52.) Thus, neither *Lee*, nor *Liu*, nor their proposed combination, teaches or suggests “an image projection system [including] a lens that creates a focal point located substantially on the outer wall for the displayed image,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, and for at least these reasons, claim 1 is not obvious over the proposed combination of *Lee* and *Liu*. Claims 2, 4, 5, and 7-23 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as based on the additional features recited therein.

For example, claim 15 recites, “wherein the device for moving the image forming devices is configured to linearly move the image forming devices.” The Office Action implies, without explicitly stating, that linear movement of the image forming devices is disclosed in Fig. 2 and col. 2, lines 22-40 of *Liu*. However, *Liu* only discloses co-rotating a transparent disk with a shaft to project a motion picture on a remote wall (See, e.g., Abstract; FIGS. 2, 5; col. 1, lines 45-50), rather than moving image forming devices linearly. Thus, because *Liu* does not teach or suggest “wherein the device for moving the image forming devices is configured to linearly move the

image forming devices,” Applicants submit that claim 15 is allowable over the proposed combination for this additional reason.

With respect to claims 4, 9, and 10, Applicants note that *Wu* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lee* and *Liu*, in that *Wu* also does not teach or suggest, “an image projection system [including] a lens that creates a focal point located substantially on the outer wall for the displayed image,” as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, for similar reasons, claims 4, 9, and 10 are also not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the cited references.

Claims 24-29

Independent claim 24, which has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled claim 26, recites “wherein the optical projection system includes an LED and collimating optics.” Thus, for similar reasons to those stated above in reference to claim 1, claim 24 is also not obvious over the proposed combination of *Lee* and *Liu*. Specifically, as noted above, *Lee* does not disclose a projection image system. Additionally, although *Liu* projects images, it does not teach or suggest an optical projection system including collimating optics, as recited in claim 24. Rather, *Liu*’s projected images travel outward from the device to a remote wall some distance away, expanding in size as they travel further away from the device. (See, e.g., FIG. 4; col. 1, lines 51-52.) As shown, for example, in FIG. 4, *Liu*’s projected image size is not constant, and the light rays in the image projection are not parallel; thus *Liu* does not include collimating optics. Therefore, because neither *Lee*, nor *Liu*, nor their proposed combination, teaches or suggests an “optical projection system [including] an LED and collimating optics,” claim 24 is not obvious over the proposed combination. Claims 25 and 27-29 depend from claim 24 and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as based on the additional features recited therein.

With respect to claims 25-27, Applicants note that *Wu* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lee* and *Liu*, in that *Wu* also does not teach or suggest an “optical projection system [including] an LED and collimating optics,” as recited in amended claim 24. Thus, for similar reasons, claims 25-27 are also not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the cited references.

Claims 30-33

Claim 30 recites, “upon a predetermined condition associated with a computer program, projecting a second image, different from the first image, onto the wall surface of the computer input device.” However, neither *Lee* nor *Liu* discloses any communication between the device and a computer program. Similarly, neither reference teaches nor suggests performing any action “upon a predetermined condition associated with a computer program.” The Office Action on page 5 states that *Liu* teaches this feature at column 2, lines 22-40. However, the relied-upon portion of *Liu*, reproduced above, does not disclose or even relate to the operation of a computer program. Further, no suggestion or motivation is identified for modifying the pointing device of *Liu* with a computer program. Accordingly, because neither *Liu*, nor *Lee*, nor their proposed combination, teaches or suggests projecting an image “upon a predetermined condition associated with a computer program,” claim 30 is not obvious over the proposed combination. Claims 31-33 depend from claim 30 and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as based on the additional features recited therein. Additionally, because it is unclear how the cited portions of *Liu* relate to this claim, Applicants respectfully requests that a subsequent Office Action that maintains these rejections and/or substantively addresses claims 30-33 be non-final to provide Applicants an opportunity to respond to such rejections when first presented.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 34-36 to more fully claim their invention. New claims 34 and 36 recite a “movable image forming element ... configured to linearly move multiple predetermined image forming devices,” and are therefore allowable for similar reasons to those stated above in reference to claim 15.

New claim 35 recites, “an image projection system including ... a lens that creates a focal point for the projected images located substantially on the outer wall,” and is therefore allowable for similar reasons to those stated above in reference to claim 1.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: January 8, 2007

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/
Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3160
Fax: (202) 824-3001